

thoughts; his personality buried in silence; to sink, in effect, into anonymity.

To say that "something needs to be done" is a hollow suggestion indeed unless specific proposals are laid upon the table.

First, Congress should initiate a program of annual increases in appropriations for research in the disorders of the brain, aiming at a four-fold increase by the end of the decade of the brain.

Second, Congress should take the necessary steps to see that a portion of its appropriation for neurological research is spent on research for PSP and other rare disorders.

Third, Congress should use committee hearings and other means at its disposal to expose to the public PSP and other rare disorders.

Fourth, Congress should use its considerable power in the public relations market to gain widespread recognition of PSP and other rare disorders.

Fifth, Congress should make known, through letters, phone calls, at hearings, personal meetings, and so forth, to the regulatory agencies their determination that remedies be found for the sufferers from PSP and other rare disorders.

But enough of telling Congress what to do. Now a plea, "please do something."

THE DEDICATED SERVICE OF RABBI ELY JEREMY ROSENZVEIG

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1993

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to pay tribute to Rabbi Ely Jeremy Rosenzveig who has unselfishly served his community and fellow man. It is with great pride that our community plans to honor Rabbi Rosenzveig who is the recipient of the 11th annual Kodimoh Brotherhood Humanitarian Award.

Rabbi Ely, as he is affectionately known throughout the community, will receive the award on Tuesday evening, June 29. An award which was instituted to honor those, like Rabbi Ely, who have distinguished themselves for their unstinting commitment and outstanding service to worthy causes in the community. Rabbi Ely is 37 years old and has served the Kodimoh congregation with great distinction for 5 years and is widely considered one of the fine young rabbis in America today.

Rabbi Ely is a loving father and husband. The rabbi and his wife Chani have four beautiful children, Ariel, Tzlona, Shifra, and Elsheva and a fifth child due this summer. Unfortunately for our community, the Rosenzveigs are moving to Stamford, CT July 1, where Rabbi Ely will assume the position of senior rabbi at a leading orthodox congregation. Our loss is Stamford's gain however, and needless to say, we wish them the very best of luck.

Mister Speaker, I salute Rabbi Rosenzveig for the important services that he has provided without fanfare. Rabbi Ely has served the Kodimoh Congregation and the community with distinction over the last 5 years. He and his wife Chani have made a tremendous impact on the entire community and when they move in July they will be greatly missed.

REPRESENTATIVE CARDISS COLLINS HONORED

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1993

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, because of the press of business in the House we often fail to recognize the accomplishments of our colleagues. I rise today to congratulate a fellow Member from the hub of the continent, Chicago, IL. This Member has reached a milestone in her service to this country and this body.

On June 5, Representative CARDISS COLLINS will have served in this body for 20 years, which makes her the longest serving black woman in the history of the Congress. Over these years, she has distinguished herself in many ways, becoming the first black woman to represent a congressional district in the Midwest, the first black and first woman to serve as a Democratic whip-at-large, and the first African-American and first woman to chair a subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce panel.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. COLLINS' accomplishments are many and various. I could go on listing the many firsts that this trailblazer has accomplished. I congratulate the Congresswoman on her anniversary. I and many other Members appreciate her contribution to the Congress and wish her many more years of service to people of the Seventh District of Illinois.

LYME DISEASE AWARENESS WEEK

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1993

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge that this week, beginning June 6, 1993, has been designated Lyme Disease Awareness Week by an act of Congress and the President. It is vitally important that the facts about this painful and often life-threatening disease are brought to the forefront. This disease does not discriminate. Amazingly, despite the immense destruction inflicted on Lyme disease victims, this ailment is transmitted by a tick no bigger than a speck of dust.

In Connecticut the number of reported cases nearly tripled in 3 years and current estimates place the number of occurrences between 500,000 and 1 million. Reported outbreaks have spread to 49 States in only the 16 short years since the disease was discovered in 1977. These statistics are overwhelming, and something must be done to find a cure soon. Researchers are endeavoring to do so with some success, but we must continue to work until this illness is no longer a threat.

As with most diseases, early detection of Lyme disease is essential to ensuring an effective remedy. If left untreated in humans, Lyme disease can cause debilitating disorders including blindness, paralysis, and death. That is why heightened awareness of this disease is critical. With the proper understanding of this disease's devastating effects, parents and physicians will more readily recognize the symptoms and can begin early and productive treatment.

Accordingly, I am pleased that this week has been designated as Lyme Disease Awareness Week and I hope that as a result of this designation the public will become more cognizant of the danger of this illness.

THE HOUSE BUDGET RECONCILIATION BILL

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1993

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss my vote on H.R. 2264, the budget reconciliation bill. After careful analysis, I decided that I could not support this package. It goes too far in raising taxes and not far enough in cutting spending.

I have the highest respect and affection for President Clinton. However, none of us were elected to be a rubber stamp. We were all elected to represent the people of our congressional districts to the best of our ability. Everywhere I go in my district, people say the same thing: cut spending and reduce the deficit. They are willing to accept additional new taxes, but they want to make certain that these tax increases are a last resort, that the President and Congress have done everything possible to reduce Government spending first.

Last fall, Mr. Clinton promised to cut spending by \$2 for every dollar he raised in new taxes. Then, in January, he revised this ratio—making it \$1 in new taxes for every dollar cut in spending. Now, the package would raise nearly twice as much in new taxes as it would cut in Government programs. Specifically, a realistic analysis indicates that under this plan there would be a net tax increase of \$246 billion over the next 5 years and net spending cuts of \$136 billion over the same period. President Clinton's original ratio has been reversed. What's more, the timetable is backward. The tax increases would be retroactive to the beginning of this year. The bulk of the spending cuts do not kick in until fiscal years 1996 and 1997. We've been down that road before, of tax increases now and spending cuts later. This is not what the American people supported or expected when they elected us last fall.

The reconciliation package also imposes an unfair burden on Social Security recipients. In my congressional district alone 28,000 families receiving Social Security benefits will see an average annual increase of more than \$500 in their tax bills. I strongly support the principle of tax fairness. But when compared to proposed increased income taxes on other Americans, it is painfully clear that taxes on seniors' Social Security benefits kick in at a much lower income threshold. For example, once the incomes of individual Social Security recipients exceed \$25,000, they pay more in income taxes. But nonseniors do not face an income tax increase until their taxable incomes exceed \$115,000. Where is the fairness in this proposal?

I am also concerned over the double-whammy effects of the Btu tax on moderate income families in New York City. Not only will these households pay more than \$120 per year, but they will face rent increases based on the Btu increase, even when the landlords do not pay the utility bills. Under city and State rent sta-

bilization laws, landlords are entitled to pass on increases in energy taxes, even when they do not pay the actual individual energy bill.

I fear that this package, if enacted as passed by the House, will come back to haunt all of us because of its emphasis on taxes over spending cuts. We must not abandon the more fiscally responsible, new Democrat approach on which we were elected.

Congress must control spending better than its ever done before. Consider the vote last week on H.R. 2118—the supplemental appropriations bill. The House approved giving the Defense Department an additional \$1.2 billion in new spending that it didn't even ask for. The Pentagon itself admitted it could raise the money by making reductions in other, nonvital programs. How can we expect any credibility with the public on raising taxes if we can't even control ourselves long enough to allow the Pentagon to make spending cuts on its own?

Those of us who call for spending cuts must be specific. Generic pronouncements on the subject don't get the job done. That's why I include a list of specific cuts that I support. If each of these cuts were enacted, the savings would total over \$153 billion over the next 5 years. That's a lot of taxes that don't need to be raised.

I sincerely hope that this package will be revised—maintaining its many progressive elements while going further to reduce spending. If we can address the critical need to cut spending further, I foresee the possibility of voting in favor of a revised package.

SUGGESTED SPENDING CUTS

Space station.—Over 5 years, this will save \$11.35 billion.

Superconducting super collider.—Over 5 years, the cutting the super collider will save \$2.8 billion.

Advanced solid rocket motor.—Cutting ASRM would save \$1.95 billion over 5 years.

C-17 cargo plane.—It is estimated that 70C-17's (the current cargo) plane could take the place of 120 C-130's, for a savings of \$11.5 billion.

Star wars.—Total elimination of funding for SDI would save \$28 billion over 5 years according to Council for a Livable World. Limiting SDI solely to an anti-missile defense system would save \$13.7 billion over 5 years, according to CBO.

Other defense cuts include.—Reduce Department of Energy Production of Nuclear Weapons—savings of \$6.25 billion over 5 years.

Terminate the Trident II missiles.—savings of \$5.8 billion over 5 years.

Cut all intelligence (CIA, NSA, DIA) funding by 20 percent.—savings of \$21.87 billion over 5 years.

Reduce Procurement of DDG-51 Destroyers.—5 year savings of \$8.35 billion.

Reduce Naval Carrier groups from 13 to 10.—5 year savings of \$16.38 billion.

Cancel Kinetic Energy Anti-Satellite Weapon Program.—5 year savings of \$100 million.

Delay development of all new weapons for 1 year.—1994 savings of \$600 million.

Cancel the National Aerospace Plane.—5 year savings of \$750 million.

Other nondefense budget cuts.—Reduce Nuclear Weapons Research by the Department of Energy—5 year savings of \$1.45 billion.

Eliminate below-cost timber sales from National Forests.—5 year savings of \$250 million.

Increase royalties for mining on Federal lands.—\$500 million increase to revenues over 5 years.

Reduce subsidies to farmers through Deficiency Payments by 3 percent per year.—5 year savings of \$11.2 billion.

Eliminate Federal subsidy for wool, mohair and honey.—5 year savings of \$580 million.

Total Savings if all cuts implemented.—\$115.25 billion over 5 years.

CONGRATULATIONS AND WELCOME TO LIFE CARE CENTER OF CORONA

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1993

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to count down the last few years of the 20th century, we are coming to recognize more and more the increasing need for quality health and life care for our senior citizens—the fastest growing segment of our population. All too often, our elderly citizens are left without the type of caring attention they need to remain productive and content members of society.

Fortunately, there are far-sighted men and women in our country who recognize that good care for the elderly can also be good business. Such is the case with Life Care Centers of America, a corporation which has established quality life care centers throughout the United States. Their centers are based on the philosophy that their customers—the residents—are their highest priority.

They believe in the preservation of dignity, self-respect, and resident rights in a loving and caring environment. They believe in the resident-centered approach to care, in which the total health needs of the resident are met. And, they believe that the resident's family should be encouraged to become closely involved with the facility in meeting the resident's needs.

Likewise, they believe that each of their centers should be a good corporate citizen of the community in which it is located, maintaining communications with the public and participating actively in community affairs, particularly related to health care.

Additionally, Life Care Centers of America strive to be good employers, believing that their employees, as associates, are the most valuable resource.

For all of these reasons, and others it is a great pleasure for me to congratulate Life Care on the opening of its new facility in my home town. We are glad to have this outstanding operation in our area, and I wish the managers, the staff, and their residents many happy years in the Life Care Center of Corona, CA.

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1993

SPEECH OF

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1993

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2294) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 7 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, in this debate on whether to pass the largest tax increase in our Nation's history, I'm appalled by some of the arguments my colleagues on the other side are utilizing. Several of my Democrat colleagues have said that we need to pass this bill in order to cut the deficit that Presidents Bush and Reagan produced.

Excuse me? Presidents Bush and Reagan increased the deficit with their budgets? Mr. Speaker, unless there have been some constitutional changes of which no one has been apprised, it is the responsibility of Congress to enact and pass the annual budget. Regardless of whether a budget comes before us from a Democrat or Republican White House, Congress deliberates and amends that proposal, and the product that is sent to the White House is the handiwork of the House and Senate.

Mr. Chairman, we have an enormous national debt. I don't think you'll hear anyone questioning that fact. But it appears to me that placing the blame on the shoulders of past Presidents is not only dubious rhetoric, it is arrogance. Do my colleagues on the other side actually believe that the American people are so glib as to believe that Congress has no say in how Federal funds are spent? Does the majority leadership actually believe that their strained attempt at shifting blame will assuage the public's genuine concern over our fiscal problems? To even suggest such is an insult to the intelligence of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, a few months ago, we heard about a new era dawning in Washington, a new approach to government, a call to national service. According to what I have heard in these hours of debate, I would have to agree there's a new approach all right. It's called the contribution and denial approach; Congress will require the American taxpayer to contribute more, and then Congress will deny it ever asked for it.

CLINTON'S BUDGET IS A LOSE-LOSE PROPOSITION

SPEECH OF

HON. SPENCER T. BACHUS III

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1993

(Mr. BACHUS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I have a new silver dollar in my hand, and this new silver dollar has two sides to it.

At the start of a Southeastern Conference football game, this coin is tossed in the air, and the referee says, "Heads, you win; tails, you lose." Like this two-sided coin, the Clinton budget bill has two sides. One side is a tax increase—the largest tax increase in the world, and most Americans know that.

But the other side of this coin—of the Clinton budget plan is something else, and it's not spending cuts; it's spending increases: \$165 billion in new domestic spending, adding \$1.3 trillion to the deficit, growing Government by 20 percent over the next 4 years, all charged to our children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, with most coins it is: Heads, you win; tails, you lose; but with the Clinton budget bill it is: Tax increases, the American people lose; spending increases, the American people lose.

There is something new about this coin, but there is absolutely nothing new about the Clinton proposal. It is tax and spend: Heads, you lose; tails, you lose.

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1993

SPEECH OF

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1993

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2264) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 7 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my opposition to the proposed Btu tax, and my support of the Kasich amendment as a Representative from Texas and as a member of the House Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I have spent considerable time on energy related issues.

First of all, as a revenue raiser, this proposed tax fails to pass a critical test: the test of fiscal responsibility. Since the tax was first proposed, various interest groups have chipped away at the package until the revenues that the tax would raise are considerably lower than expected. Originally, the tax was expected to raise \$25 billion annually by 1997. But, according to the Institute for Research on the Economics of Taxation, \$20 billion of those revenues will be needed to offset proposed credits, assistance to those on low incomes, and reduced revenues from other sources due to depressed economic activity. We are being asked to vote for an energy tax that will cost this country more than 400,000 jobs, and that will raise just \$5 billion? If we pass this misguided tax, never in our Nation's history will so many have sacrificed so much for so little.

Another argument for the energy tax, that we have heard from the administration, is that the tax is environmentally friendly—that Americans will become more energy efficient and move toward greater use of clean fuels. I believe that this is another argument that fails to pass an important test: the reality test. While shutting down 26 refineries may improve the environment in this country, what will it do to the global environment as refineries are built in countries with less stringent environmental regulations? What will increased tanker traffic do to our coastal communities? How many more oil spills will we have? How will the country get its supply of reformulated gas and other mandated clean fuels? What impact will increased imports have on our trade deficit? What about national security? About the only positive environmental impact this tax package will produce is that in destroying 400,000 American jobs, there will be fewer commuters driving their cars to work each day!

Between the Clean Air Act and this proposed tax, this country will lose almost 20 percent of its refinery capacity by the end of the decade. In addition to the refinery problem, the tax is punitive to clean fuels, providing little incentives for industries to switch to more environmentally sound fuels like natural gas.

Third, the administration has argued that the reason it proposed a Btu energy tax is that it is fair to every region of the country. If this tax is so fair, why will Texans be paying 75 times more in energy taxes than people who live in Vermont by the year 1996? The national average for energy use per capita in 1989, was 330 million Btu's, in Texas it was 495 million Btu's. Texas residents and industries are major consumers of energy as well as major producers. It is ludicrous to assume that they will pay equal taxes as other parts of the country. A study by Texas A&M University predicts that the State will lose \$3.089 billion per year by 1998, in gross State product [GSP]. The energy tax will reduce personal income by \$3.26 billion in Texas, with the average family of four paying an additional \$708 a year in energy taxes. This increase is more than twice what the administration is predicting for the rest of the country.

But Texas is not alone. Other States that are highly energy-intensive and whose residents travel long distances will also feel a much greater impact from the proposed tax than currently predicted by the administration. So, this proposed tax fails to pass another test: the fairness test.

The proposed Btu tax which, at best, will raise \$71.5 billion through fiscal year 1998, but, at worst, will cost more than 400,000 Americans their jobs—will also, lower our gross domestic product [GDP], make it difficult for senior citizens and others living on fixed incomes to afford the energy they need, and will continue the decline of our domestic energy industry. There are other less costly ways to decrease the deficit, improve the environment, and become more energy efficient.

Many Members have put forward proposals to achieve deficit reduction without this onerous energy tax and other proposed taxes. I wrote to President Clinton on March 8 of this year, with a list of spending cuts and freezes that would result in a savings of \$384 billion over a 5-year period. This could be accomplished without imposing even 1 cent in new or increased taxes.

Congress has passed two major laws in the last 3 years that will improve our energy efficiency and our environment. The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, and the National Energy Policy Act of 1992, provide additional programs and incentives to use environmentally friendly fuels, cut back on many air pollutants, switch to cleaner fuels, and so forth. Why don't we give these laws a chance to work before inflicting even greater financial pain on the consumer and the energy industry for very few, if any, benefits?

Mr. Chairman, generally when someone or something fails to pass the test, it is time to go back to the drawing board, to relearn, or reinvent. I believe that this is what we need to do with this reconciliation bill, especially the proposed Btu tax. That is why I urge my colleagues to support the Kasich amendment to reduce the deficit in a fiscally responsible, fair, and real way.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1993

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1993

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2118) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and I do so reluctantly. The gentleman from Nebraska, [Mr. BEREUTER] is one of the best Members in this House. He is concerned about education, he is concerned about everything that is in the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill that we will bring out here in about 3 or 4 more weeks.

If this amendment were adopted, as the gentleman knows, it would cut the Summer Youth Program employment about 10,000 jobs.

As far as cooperative education is concerned, I know the gentleman's interest there. We have the same interest. There are 14 items where the money has not been used and also is not incorporated in the 1994 budget. That is why we rescinded the money to pay for summer jobs. But I want to assure the gentleman from Nebraska that when we go to conference on this bill, the gentleman's request certainly will be in the mind of every conferee. We know of his interest, and we know how he has helped us in the past.

Mr. Chairman, reluctantly we would have to be against this amendment. It would cut 10,000 jobs, and I know the gentleman from Nebraska does not want to do that.

I ask that the amendment be defeated.

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1993

SPEECH OF

HON. BLANCHE M. LAMBERT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1993

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2264) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 7 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994.

Ms. LAMBERT. Mr. Chairman, voting against this deficit-reducing package would raise an impassable stop sign on our road toward economic recovery. Our \$4 trillion deficit did not sprout up overnight and we cannot cut it down in 1 day either. But this package offers us the first real attempt at deficit reduction that this Nation has seen in 12 years. The entitlement caps and deficit reduction trust fund that

this legislation provides are key to getting our Nation back on track.

President Clinton's plan is a real step toward reducing the deficit and it's a step which the American public has repeatedly cried out for in the last year. Within 5 years, this plan will reduce the deficit from nearly 5 percent of our gross domestic product to 2.6 percent of the GDP. The deficit trust fund offers the American people a legally binding promise that spending cuts and tax increases will go toward reducing the deficit.

The people of the First District of Arkansas have called for spending cuts and we have answered by freezing discretionary spending at 1993 levels for 5 years. This will save \$102 billion.

The proposed tax increases and spending cuts are not easy to swallow. But they present a sincere effort at reigning in the feel-good spending of the last 12 years, under which our national debt grew. I am especially pleased with the addition of entitlement caps that will sound an alarm to be heard by Congress and the President if entitlement spending goes too high. These caps will force Congress to come together and vote before allowing spending to exceed the caps.

As a representative of the agriculture-intensive First District of Arkansas, I have shared our farmers' concern over the proposed Btu tax. I have stood at this very podium and spoken on radio and TV against the Btu tax because I believe it will place an unfair burden on farmers who cannot pass added costs on to consumers. But Senator BOREN's alternative to the Btu tax would cut Social Security. And no one from the First District of Arkansas has called asking me to cut Social Security spending.

I continue to oppose the Btu tax, but I feel confident from the commitments I received in phone calls this morning that the Btu tax will be reduced or eliminated in the Senate or in conference committee. Today's vote does not flash a green light for the Btu tax, and I urge the farmers in Arkansas to be patient with Congress as we work over the next few months to eliminate this tax.

In conclusion, having talked to Arkansans who have repeatedly asked for spending cuts and deficit reduction, I cannot in good conscience vote against this package which goes so far toward fulfilling their request. Therefore, I stand in support of this legislation under the blinking yellow light of caution. I will continue to work toward necessary changes in the Btu tax, but I firmly believe the remainder of this proposal puts us in the express lane toward economic recovery.

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1993

SPEECH OF
HON. TIMOTHY J. PENNY
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1993

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2264) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 7 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, the public debate raging in this country about the role of

Government, the responsiveness of public institutions, and the size of our Federal debt, are joined in the debate on the budget reconciliation measure before us today. The American people have been rightly critical of the inability of the Congress and the President to responsibly resolve the budget deficit in recent years. While gridlock gripped Washington, the American people have struggled with the consequences of our inaction.

The 1992 election brought a new President dedicated to making Government work—dedicated also to reducing the budget deficit. While we can be critical of his handling of this measure, I believe the President has not been given sufficient credit for putting before the country the very real and painful choices that are necessary to reduce the budget deficit.

Some here do not like the President's priorities and have suggested alternatives, others among us continue to talk about deficit reduction as if solutions will appear out of thin air. Well, the choices are tough—very tough. I doubt if any Member of Congress truly likes this measure; there are no cheerleaders for higher taxes and program cuts for their own sake. But eliminating the deficit requires taxes and cuts. Those are the choices—and they are difficult for all of us.

I had hoped this bill would contain more cuts, less taxes, and more deficit reduction. But, as Benjamin Franklin once said, "He that lives upon hope will die fasting." At some point, consensus among the alternatives must be reached. And what we have before is not perfect, but it is the best we can do at this time, and it is certainly preferable to doing nothing.

Let me just speak briefly to the bill because there are a number of important provisions. The entitlement cap in this bill, which I helped to negotiate, is unprecedented. For the first time, a process is established for reviewing the growth of mandatory spending programs, which together represent almost one-half of all Federal outlays. For too long, one half of all spending has been on automatic pilot, unrestrained by the annual budget process. With the passage of this bill, that will change. Both the President and the Congress will now be forced to propose changes to entitlement programs to rein in their growth. That is a very important reform. It will lead, I believe, to real long-term deficit reduction. It will force the Congress in the future to face the deficit issue squarely and honestly.

The extension of the discretionary budget caps in this measure—the only real brake on the growth of Federal spending since 1990—is also an important reform.

This measure contains nearly \$500 billion in real deficit reduction over the next 5 years. With tough enforcement on entitlement and discretionary spending, real long-term deficit reduction will occur.

Someone once said: "It is natural for man to shut his eyes against a painful truth." Today, we open our eyes and make a few tough decisions. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

ASIAN-PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

SPEECH OF
HON. PATSY T. MINK
OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1993

Mrs. MINK. Madam Speaker, I am privileged to join my colleagues here today to celebrate Asian-Pacific American Heritage Month and to recognize the achievements and contributions of Asian and Pacific-Americans in our society.

I want to thank my esteemed colleague, the delegate from American Samoa, EM FALEOMAVAEGA, for his leadership in organizing this event and for giving us this opportunity to share with the Congress and the American people more about our experiences as Asian-Pacific Americans.

Like the many immigrants from the West, those who have come to this country from Asia and the Pacific bring with them a rich cultural heritage that has become a part of the complex and diverse set of traditions, mores, values, and customs that make up American culture.

From first generation Americans who fled their homeland because of political strife to third, fourth, and fifth generation Americans whose ancestors came many years ago to seek their fortune in this new land of opportunity, Asian-Pacific Americans have enriched and enhanced this country.

Today Asian-Pacific Americans are the fastest growing demographic group in the Nation. Although this group currently comprises only about 3 percent of the U.S. population, it increased in size by over 100 percent from 1980 to 1990. And there is every indication that this rapid growth of the Asian-Pacific American community will continue throughout the next century. It is estimated that by the year 2020 the Asian-Pacific population will be about 20 million, a 177-percent increase from 1990.

Americans of Asian and Pacific Island ancestry have gained national and international prominence, making a distinctive mark in just about every aspect of our society—in science, business, education, medicine, in the arts and in athletics. Just the other night I joined Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA in honoring Al Noga, a professional football player of Samoan ancestry who has joined the Washington Redskins.

While many Asian-Pacific Americans have been successful in their respective fields, these individuals represent a minority of the Asian-Pacific community. There is a wide spread myth that Asian-Pacific Americans tend to do better than other populations, that we have achieved high educational and economic status in society and therefore are doing well. We've even been dubbed the model minority.

However, this is not really the case for most Asian-Pacific Americans. While many have achieved educational and economic success, most Asian-Pacific Americans are not in the upper rungs of the socioeconomic ladder.

This myth of the model minority does not take into account that most Asian-Pacific Americans are newcomers to our Nation and face countless language, social, cultural, and economic barriers. Of the 9 million Americans of Asian and Pacific Island ancestry over 65 percent are foreign born.

This myth does not take into account the large differences among Asian-Pacific Amer-